DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 404 EC 160 004

AUTHOR Bragman, Ruth
TITLE Evaluation of an Undergraduate and Graduate (Master's) Program in Special Education.
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Mid-South Education Convention (New Orleans, LA, November, 1982).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Graduate Study; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Education; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

Sixty supervisors, 44 graduates of the undergraduate program and 47 master's program graduates, completed questionnaires to evaluate the special education program at Memphis State University. In addition, 26 supervisors and 70 graduates were interviewed. Results revealed that 10 program components were found to be very important or essential for special educators by all participants. The preparation that students received from the program was rated as "better than adequate" to "good." Primary strengths of the preparation were in assessment techniques, behavior and classroom management methods, and knowledge of characteristics of exceptional learners. Relative weaknesses were in interactions with families, teachers, and administrators and in use of community resources. No differences were found in the ratings by supervisors and graduates of either the undergraduate or graduate program. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED232404

Evaluation of an Undergraduate and Graduate (Master's) Program in Special Education

Paper Presented at
The Annual Mid-South Education Convention
New Orleans
November, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ruth Bragman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ruth Bragman, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation
Memphis State University

EC160004

In this time of public concern, questionable federal commitment and professional reappraisal of educational endeavors, program monitoring and accountability are essential. Consequently, systematic measures of the extent to which a program is reaching its intended target population and the extent to which the service being delivered matches what it intends to deliver is critical. (Rossi & Freman, 1982). With these goals in mind, in the Fall of 1981, the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation at Memphis State University developed an evaluation plan to assess the effectiveness of its undergraduate and graduate programs (Masters in Education) in providing teacher preparation. The results of this plan were then to be used for planning and curriculum modifications of specific components of the program, as necessary.

The evaluation involved three target populations: graduates, from the last three years (Spring 1979-Fall 1981), of the undergraduate program; graduates, from the last three years (Spring 1979-Fall 1981), of the masters program; and supervisors of graduates of these programs. The questionnaire addressed 1) attitudes toward the importance of the ten basic components of the programs and 2) attitudes toward the preparation of graduates of the programs received in the ten basic components of the program.

Questions Addressed

The following questions were addressed:

1. What importance did supervisors of graduates from the special education program give to each of the ten components?

2. What importance did graduates of the undergraduate program give to each of the ten components?

3. What importance did graduates of the masters program give to each of the ten components?

4. Did supervisors, graduates of the undergraduate program, and graduates of the masters program vary in the importance they placed on the ten components?

5. How adequate did supervisors of graduates of the special education program feel the preparation was in the ten components?

6. How adequately prepared did graduates of the undergraduate program feel they were in the ten components?

7. How adequately prepared did graduates of the masters program feel they were in the ten components?

8. Did supervisors, graduates of the undergraduate program and graduates of the masters program vary in their feelings as to the preparation received in the ten components?

9. How adequate, overall, did supervisors of graduates of the special education program feel the preparation was?

10. How adequately prepared, overall, did graduates of the undergraduate program feel they were?

11. How adequately prepared, overall, did graduates of the masters program feel they were?

12. Did supervisors, graduates of the undergraduate program and graduates of the masters program vary in their feelings as to the overall preparation received?

13. What are the strengths of the programs?

14. What modifications are necessary in the programs?

15. What are graduates present positions?

The evaluation plan developed consisted of four (4) stages:

1. The development of the questionnaires to be sent to graduates of the department and supervisors of graduates.

2. The selection of graduates of the department and supervisors of graduates to be sent questionnaires and to participate in phone interviews.

3. The mailing of the questionnaires and conducting of the phone interviews.

4. The analysis of the results.

Development of the Questionnaires

The objectives of the special education programs were reviewed and ten basic components of the programs were identified. Rough drafts of the questionnaires were developed to include these components and the evaluation goals. Modifications of these questionnaires were then made, based on the suggestions of the coordinator of the undergraduate program, the coordinator of the masters program and the chairman of the department.

The final questionnaires asked supervisors, graduates of the undergraduate program, and graduates of the graduate program to rate each of the ten components on a 5-point scale as to the importance to

special education each component with: (1) undesirable, (2) desireable, (3) important, (4) very important, (5) essential. Each component was to be rated on a 5-point scale as to the preparation received from Memphis State University with (1) not adequate, (2) barely adequate, (3) adequate, (4) good and (5) excellent. Additional comments were requested as to the strengths of the program and modifications necessary. Demographic information was also collected. The final copies of these questionnaires are included in Appendix A.

Test/retest reliability of the questionnaires was then determined. Twenty student teachers in special education were asked to complete the questionnaire at two different times (one week interval). The test/retest reliability was: total [including overall rating of program (21 items)] .9480, two scales [excluding overall rating of program (20 items)] .9514, scale one [importance (10 items)] .9156, scale two [preparation (10 items)] .8700. In addition, students made general comments about the program. These comments along with the means for the items are presented in a later section of this report.

Subject Selection

A list was developed of graduates of the undergraduate program from Spring 1979 to Fall 1981 (164 students) and of graduates of the master's program for the same time period (153 students). From these lists 106 undergraduate students and 106 graduate students were randomly selected to be sent questionnaires. In addition 35 graduates of the undergraduate program and 35 graduates of the master program were randomly selected to participate in phone interviews. (The addresses and phone number for these students were obtained from the Office of Institutional Research).

A list was developed by the faculty members of the Department of Special Education of all agencies in the Memphis and surrounding area that might employ graduates of the programs. All agencies on this list were sent questionnaires (48) and thirteen (13) were selected to participate in phone interviews. In addition supervisors in the public schools in the surrounding areas with at least two schools within their district were sent questionnaires (22) and two (2) were randomly selected to participate in phone interviews. Employment information indicated that the majority of the graduates would be employed by the city and county schools so questionnaires were sent to the principals of 30 randomly selected schools in the city and eight (8) randomly selected schools in the county. The directors of special education for the city and the county schools were also sent questionnaires. Eight (8) principals from the city schools and three (3) from the county were randomly selected to participate in phone interviews. The total number of supervisors from the public school sector was 60 who were mailed questionnaires and thirteen (13) to participate in the phone interviews. The total number of supervisors mailed questionnaires was 108 and the total number selected to participate in phone interviews was 26.

Mailing of Questionnaires and Conducting Phone Interviews

All questionnaires were confidential. The first mailing was on March 11, 1982. (Postage paid, addressed envelopes were included). One month later on April 11, 1982, another copy of the questionnaire was mailed (with postage paid, addressed envelopes) with a letter expressing the department's appreciation if the questionnaire had been returned and a reminder if it had not been returned.

Phone interviews were conducted from March 27, 1982 to April 17, 1982. All interviews were conducted by the same person. The questions asked followed those of the mailed questionnaire however probes were used to obtain more information when appropriate.

Results

By June 1, 1982 a total of 164 questionnaires (51.2% of total sent) had been returned. Of those returned 151 were analyzed: 60 from supervisors (55.5% of total sent); 44 from graduates of the undergraduate program (41.5% of total sent); 47 from graduates of the graduate program (44.3% of the total sent). Those not included were: five (5) from supervisors with no contact with MSU graduates, five (5) with no forwarding addresses, and three (3) with less than 50% of the questionnaire completed. In addition to completing the checklist on the questionnaire, additional comments were written by: 70% of the supervisors (with one writing over five (5) pages); 86% of the graduates of the undergraduate program and 87% of the graduates of the Masters program. The average number of years in the present position for all who completed the questionnaires was 3.56 and the average number of years of teaching for the graduates was 4.00. The average number of special education teacher supervised was 8.88, average number of graduates from the undergraduate program at MSU was 2.04 and from the graduate program was 1.4. Eighteen (18) of the responses were made by persons in private schools, 103 in public schools, and 22 in other (7 were not involved in education and 1 was missing). (See the Technical Report for Table 1 which gives a breakdown of the number of responses by year of graduation; Table 2 and Table 3 which give

breakdowns of number of responses by position; and Table 4 which gives a breakdown of responses of graduates of the masters program by undergraduate degree.)

Of the twenty-six supervisors contacted to be interviewed, seven (7) had no knowledge of the program. Of the nineteen contacted (73%) nine (9) were with the public schools and 20 with private schools and other. Attempts were made to contact 70 graduates of the program, however only 25 could be contacted (33.3%). Of these 12 were graduates of the undergraduate program and 13 were graduates of the graduate program. (See the Technical Report for Table 1 which gives a breakdown of number of responses of students by year of graduation. Table 2 gives a breakdown of responses by present position. Table 3 gives a breakdown of the graduates of the masters program by undergraduate degree).

For the analysis of the results the questionnaire data was not pooled with the interview data due to the differences in the data collection techniques.

Question 1: What importance did supervisors of graduates from the special education program give to each of the ten components? The average scores on the ten components of the program for the supervisors are given in Table I. From observations of the scores it can be noted that all the components are rated above 3.68, with 8 items* above 4.0. The most important item from the questionnaire data was #6: the translation of assessment data (4.80) and the lowest was #10: use of community resources (3.68). The overall average for all ten items was 4.38. For the interview data no scores were below 4.0 with

*The terms: item, questions, and components, are used interchangeably.

the highest being 4.88 for classroom and behavior management. The lowest item was #1: history and trends and issues (4.09). The overall average for all ten items was 4.60. It must be noted that even the lowest items had high scores.

Question 2: What importance did graduates of the undergraduate program give to each of the ten components? The average scores on the ten components of the program for the graduates of the undergraduate program are given in Table II. From observations of the scores it can be noted that all the components are rated above 3.95, with 9 items above 4.0. The most important item from the questionnaire data was item #6: translation of assessment findings (4.82) and the lowest was item #1: history and trends and issues (3.95). The overall average for all ten items was 4.56. For the interview data all components were rated above 3.50 with 9 items above 4.0. The highest item was #7: classroom and behavior management (5.0) and the lowest was #4: theory of learning and human development (3.50). The overall average for all ten items was 4.59. It must be noted that even the lowest items had high scores.

Question 3: What importance did graduates of the graduate program give to each of the ten components? The average scores of the ten components of the program for the graduates of the graduate program are given in Table III. From observation of the questionnaire scores it can be noted that all the components are rated above 4.0. The most important item from the questionnaire data was #2: local, state and federal laws (4.70). The lowest score was 4.08 on item #10: use of community resources. The overall average for all ten items was 4.42. For the interview data the highest score was 4.92 for #3:

characteristics of exceptional learners and the lowest score was 4.16 for item #4: theory of learning and human development. The overall average for all ten items was 4.52. It must be noted that even the lowest items had a high score.

Question 4: Did supervisors, graduates of the undergraduate program, and graduates of the masters program vary in the importance they placed on the ten components? Chi square was used to determine if there was difference among rating given for each of the components by supervisors and graduates of each of the programs. Since independences of observations was violated alpha was set for .005 rather than .05. With alpha at .005 no differences were found among these groups for any of the components. The obtained chi squared and probabilities are given in Table V.

Question 5: How adequate did supervisors of graduates of the special education program feel the preparation was in the ten components? The average scores on the ten components of the program for the supervisors are given in Table I and the summary of the comments are given in Technical Report Tables 5 and 6. From observations of the scores from the questionnaire data it can be noted that all of the components are rated above 3.18 (It should be noted that the number of responses for item #10 is only 28 due to a clerical error on the questionnaire). The area that students are best trained is #2: local, state, and federal laws (3.97). The area that the students are weakest in is #10: use of community resources (3.18). Due to the clerical error, if this item is omitted then the weakest area is #4: theory of learning and human development (3.38). The overall average for all ten items was 3.68. From the interview data, the strongest item was also item

#2 with a score of 4.24 and the weakest area was also #10, (3.79). The overall average for all ten items was 4.03. Again care is necessary in that even the lowest scores are high.

Question 6: How adequately prepared did graduates of the undergraduate program feel they were in the ten components. The average scores on the ten components of the program for these students are the Technical Report Tables 7 and 8. From observations of the scores from the questionnaire data it can be noted that all the components are rated above 3.11 with two items rated above 4.00. The area the students feel best trained in is Item #5 and 7: assessment, and behavior and classroom management (4.04). The area the students feel least trained in is item #10: use of community resource (3.11). The overall average of all ten items was 3.71. From the interview data the area best trained is #2 and #7: state, local and federal laws and the classroom and behavior management (4.42). The areas the students feel weakest is #10: use of community resources (2.92). The overall average for all ten items was 3.89.

Question 7: How adequately prepared did graduates of the masters program feel they were in the ten components? The average scores on the ten components of the program for these students are given in Table 2 and the summary of the comments are given in Technical Report Tables 9 and 10. From observations of the scores from the questionnaire data it can be noted that all but one of the components are rated above 3.21, one is rated 2.91. The area that students are best trained in is area #2: local, state and federal laws (3.85). The area the students feel the weakest in is #9: communication with parents, teachers, and administrations (2.91). The overall average for all ten

items was 3.54. From the interview data the area that the students feel the strongest in is #1: history, trends and issues (4.54) and the area they feel the weakest in is #9 and #6: assessment and communication (3.58). The overall average for all ten items was 3.88.

Question 8: Did supervisors, graduates of the undergraduate program and graduates of the masters program vary in their feelings as to the preparation received in the ten components. Chi squared was used to determine if there was a difference among rating given for each of the components by supervisors and graduates of each of the programs. Since independence of observations was violated alpha was set for .005 rather than .05. With alpha at .005 no differences were found among these groups for any of the components. The obtained chi squared and probabilities are givin in Table V.

Question 9: How adequately, overall, did supervisors of graduates of the special education program, feel the preparation was? The overall rating was 4.30 for questionnaires and 4.25 for interviews (See Table I). From the comments received there was a very positive attitude toward the program and support for the program. Of course there may be a biase in responses, in that people not pleased with the program may not have returned the questionnaires. All but one of the phone interviews was positive.

Question 10: How adequately prepared, overall, did graduates of the undergraduate program feel they were? The overall rating was 4.43 for questionnaires and 4.42 for the interviews (see Table II). From the comments received there was a very positive attitude toward the program. Of course there may be a bias in responses in that people not pleased with the program may not have returned the questionaires. Phone interviews were positive.

Question 11: How adequately prepared overall, did graduates of the masters program feel they were? The overall rating was 4.28 for the questionnaires and 4.38 for the interviews (See Table III). Again overall the attitudes were very positive to the program but there may be a bias in the responses. From the phone interviews however a very positive feeling was given.

Question 12: Did supervisors, graduates of the undergraduate program and graduates of the masters program vary in their feelings as to the overall preparation received? Chi squared was used to determine if there was a difference among rating given for the overall program by supervisors and graduate of each program. Chi square was 5.08 with a probability of .7490, and therfore was not significant. There was no difference in rating of the overall program. The obtained chi squared and probabilities are given in Table V.

Question 13: What are the strengths of the programs? Table VI presents a summary of the data for each component across all groups for the questionnaire data. From inspection of this table it can be noted that seven (7) of the components had mode responses of good (4). One area had a mode of excellent (5). This component was: the knowledge and application of diagnostics and educational assessment. The area with the highest mean was: characteristics of exceptional learners and the area with the second highest mean was: classroom and behavior management. The highest medium was in assessment techniques and the second highest medium was in classroom and behavior management. The summary of the comments made are given in the technical reports in tables 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. Many of these comments support the above findings. The strengths most often mentioned were: the varied practicum, assessment and behavior management, and the staff.

Question 14: What modifications are necessary in the program? From Table VI it can be noted that the two lowest areas with mode responses of adequate (3) were interactions with families, teachers and administrators and community resources. These two areas also had the two lowest mean and medium scores. It should be noted that the only area that had a mode less than 5 (essential) in the importance of each component was also: use of community resources. The mode for this item was 4 (very important). The summary of the comments made is given in the technical report in Tables 12, 3, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. There was a wide variety of responses however some of the major concerns addressed were: more specific training, problems due to preparation in one area and placement in another area, and inconsistencies within the program.

Question 15: What are graduates present positions? Table 2 in the technical report present the positions of the graduates who returned the questionnaires or were interviewed. It can be noted that 59.5% of the graduates are presently in special education positions and 85.3% are in the teaching field. The students are working in a wide variety of educational situations.

Discussion

One of the major results of this evaluation came from the process of evaluation. All of the people interviewed were very supportive of this project. They appreciated the time being taken to find out about how they felt about the program and their needs. Some were even interested in the final reports and required copies (seven (7) supervisors, four (4) graduates and nine (9) student-teachers). While the

return rate from the mailed questionnaires was not as high as desired those returned questionnaires, in the majority of the cases, indicated a caring. Over seventy percent (70%) of the questionnaires had comments written on them (up to five written pages).

All of the components selected by the Department of Special Education as important were also found to be important by the supervisors and graduates of the programs. The average of ten items was 4.46. This supports the validity of the instrument and the findings. In addition the results found from the questionnaires and the interviews were consistent even with the differences in the sample sizes.

The preparation that the graduates received from the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation was found to be more than adequate in nine areas. Only one item was below 3.0 (2.92) with the average of all the items being 3.61 (on a five point scale) indicating that the Department is doing a better than adequate to good job. The overall rating of the program was 4.33.

The majority of the comments addressed five major areas. The practicums were found to be beneficial and well supervised by most of the individuals however a few responses suggested more was necessary. The supervisors felt that the graduates were well prepared in the law. The graduates however varied in their views of the preparation. This variation reflected the date of graduation with the more recent graduates feeling more prepared in writing IEPs and in the law. This change in feeling about preparation reflects changes in the Department due to the changing field and should be seen very positively. The assessment courses and behavior management courses were seen to be strengths of the program by most while it was felt by some that more

was needed - a few state there is never too much. One area that rarely had a negative statement made was related to the staff. The majority of the responses indicated that the staff knows its subject matter, are humanistic, caring and cooperative.

Overall this evaluation found that the Department of Special Education and Rehabiliation at Memphis State is doing an adequate to good job with preparing Special Education teachers. The majority of the graduates are employed in the education field and the community is very supportive of the program. This may be the best feed-back as to the preparation the students are receiving and the attitude of the supervisors as to the preparation.

TABLE I

Mean Scores on Ten Components
of the Program for Supervisors

	Importance of Component	
Component #	Questionnaire[1]	Interview[2]
1	3.70	4.09
2	4.48	4.24
3	4.45	4.74
4	4.32	4.50
5	4.60	4.85
6	4.80	4.82
7	4.73	4.88
8	4.52	4.85
9	4.58	4.76
10	3.68	4.24
	Preparation of Students in Component	
Component #	Questionnaire	Interview
1	3.48	4.06
2	3.97	4.24
3	3.67	4.18
4	3.38	3.94
5	3.67	3.90
6	3.59	3.94
7	3.78	4.20
8	3.54	4.15
9	3.59	3.94
10	3.18[3]	3.79
Overall Preparation	Questionnaire	Interview
1 n=60	4.30	4.25
2 n=25		
3 n=28		

TABLE II

Mean Scores on Ten Components of the Program
for Graduates of the Undergraduate Program

	Importance of Component	
Component #	Questionnaire[1]	Interview[2]
1	3.95	4.12
2	4.52	4.75
3	4.80	4.92
4	4.32	3.50
5	4.73	4.92
6	4.82	4.67
7	4.80	5.00
8	4.70	4.92
9	4.68	4.67
10	4.32	4.42

	Preparation Received in Component	
Component #	Questionnaire	Interview
1	3.98	4.08
2	3.32	4.42
3	3.91	4.29
4	3.82	4.12
5	4.04	3.92
6	3.93	3.75
7	4.04	4.42
8	3.80	3.75
9	3.14	3.21
10	3.11	2.92

Overall Preparation	Questionnaire	Interview
1 n=44	4.43	4.42
2 n=12		

TABLE III

Mean Scores on Ten Components of the Program
for Graduates of the Graduate Program

	Importance of Component	
Component #	Questionnaire[1]	Interview[2]
1	4.28	4.58
2	4.70	4.85
3	4.53	4.92
4	4.15	3.16
5	4.51	4.73
6	4.64	4.77
7	4.53	4.42
8	4.36	4.54
9	4.42	4.81
10	4.08	4.46
	Preparation Received in Component	
Component #	Questionnaire	Interview
1	3.74	4.54
2	3.85	4.42
3	3.81	4.00
4	3.62	3.62
5	3.62	4.08
6	3.55	3.58
7	3.57	3.69
8	3.53	3.69
9	2.91	3.58
10	3.21	3.65
Overall Preparation	Questionnaire	Interview
1 n=47	4.28	4.38
2 n=13		

TABLE IV

Mean Scores on Ten Components of the Program for Student-Teachers[1]

Component #	Importance of Component
1	4.15
2	4.15
3	4.70
4	4.30
5	4.75
6	4.60
7	4.75
8	4.50
9	4.60
10	4.60

Component #	Preparation Received in Component
1	3.55
2	3.40
3	4.50
4	3.90
5	3.85
6	3.90
7	4.35
8	3.85
9	3.25
10	3.25
Overall Preparation	3.95

1 n=20

TABLE V

Analysis of Differences

Importance of Component		
Component #	Chi squared	Probability
1	15.38	.0175
2	10.59	.2258
3	7.88	.2473
4	8.43	.2082
5	3.21	.2817
6	5.44	.2451
7	9.54	.1453
8	6.08	.4140
9	5.47	.4855
10	16.12	.0130

Preparation Received		
Component #	Chi squared	Probability
1	18.44	.0181
2	9.40	.3095
3	5.84	.6650
4	9.16	.3287
5	11.10	.1961
6	11.01	.2010
7	12.50	.1304
8	7.99	.4347
9	8.86	.3544
10	4.84	.7720

TABLE VI

Descriptive Statistics of the Questionnaire Data as Related to the Ten Components of the Program

Component #	Mean	Standard Deviation	Medium	Mode
		Importance		
1	3.960	.923	3.987	5
2	4.572	.706	4.755	5
3	4.599	.664	4.762	5
4	4.309	.743	4.407	5
5	4.612	.641	4.776	5
6	4.748	.465	4.843	5
7	4.695	.589	4.832	5
8	4.536	.681	4.714	5
9	4.546	.717	4.740	5
10	4.059	.816	4.103	4
Component #		Preparation		
1	3.776	.863	3.833	4
2	3.673	1.069	3.820	4
3	3.784	.931	3.857	4
4	3.633	.965	3.667	4
5	3.765	1.135	3.915	5
6	3.656	1.033	3.710	4
7	3.778	1.053	3.894	4
8	3.596	.988	3.667	4
9	3.309	1.203	3.344	3
10	3.157	1.183	3.163	3
Overall Preparation	4.327	.839	4.483	5

N = 151

Appendix A

Questionnaires

Dear Supervisor:

The Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Memphis State University, is conducting a follow-up evaluation of its special education program. The results of this study will be used to reinforce and modify our program, as necessary.

We would appreciate you completing the enclosed form as soon as possible and returning it in the addressed envelope we have included.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact:

Dr. Ruth Bragman
Department of Special Education & Rehabilitation
Memphis State University
Phone: 454-2773

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation

Enclosure

An Equal Opportunity University

EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS

As part of an effort to appraise the effectiveness of our program in Special Education, we are soliciting reactions of supervisors who work with our Special Education graduates as related to different aspects of our program. You have been selected as a representative supervisor. Your name is not requested so that all information will be completely confidential. Your openness and accuracy in completing this survey is greatly desired.

The faculty of the College of Education, Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation wishes to thank you for your cooperation.

General Information

Male _____ Female _____

Age _____

Number of Special Education teachers you supervise _____

Number of Special Education teachers you supervise who are graduates of the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation at Memphis State University. Undergraduate Degrees _____ Graduate Degrees _____

Present position _____

Years in present position _____

Type of facility: Private or parochial school _____ Public school _____ Other _____ (identi

Check the most appropriate description of your present attitude towards the preparation that Special Education teachers receive at Memphis State University.

A. Very satisfied _____
B. Somewhat satisfied _____
C. Neutral _____
D. Somewhat dissatisfied _____
E. Very dissatisfied _____

(OVER)

An Equal Opportunity University

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SUPERVISORS OF GRADUATES
IN SPECIAL EDUCATION FROM MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Directions: On the left please evaluate each statement as to its importance to Special Education by circling the appropriate numeral. (1) undesirable, (2) desirable, (3) important, (4) very important, (5) essential. On the right, circle the numeral that best describes the overall performance in each area of the graduates of Memphis State University's program in Special Education (1) not adequate, (2) barely adequate, (3) adequate, (4) good, (5) excellent.

Importance (Undesirable – Essential)		Preparation (Not Adequate – Excellent)
1 2 3 4 5	1. Understands the history of Special Education and current trends and issues in the field.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	2. Complies with the content and intent of local, state and federal laws, regulations and guidelines.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	3. Knows the characteristics of and the social-educational needs of exceptional learners across different age ranges and with different handicapping conditions of varying degrees of severity.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	4. Understands and applies the basic theoretical frameworks used to explain normal behavior, development, and learning.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	5. Knows and applies procedures of diagnostic and educational assessment.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	6. Translates assessment findings into instructional activities appropriate to individual needs.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	7. Applies appropriate classroom and behavior management techniques.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	8. Implements and evaluates educational plans through the use of appropriate instructional methodology, curricula, and materials.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	9. Develops appropriate interactions with families of exceptional learners, regular classroom teachers, school administrators, and other support staff who provide services to exceptional learners.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	10. Improves the educational program for exceptional students by use of community resources.	1 2 3 4 5

Additional comments _____

What Special Education program experience information, skills, etc. have you found most beneficial for our graduates?

Which ones were not in our program, but which are necessary for Special Education teachers?

Dear Graduate:

The Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Memphis State University is conducting a follow-up evaluation of its special education program. The results of this study will be used to reinforce and modify our program, as necessary.

We would appreciate you completing the enclosed form as soon as possible and returning it in the addressed envelope we have included.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact:

Dr. Ruth Bragman
Department of Special Education & Rehabilitation
Memphis State University
Phone: 454-2773

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation

Enclosure

An Equal Opportunity University

EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS

As part of an effort to appraise the effectiveness of our program in Special Education, we are soliciting reactions of our graduates related to different aspects of our program. You have been selected as a representative of your graduating class for this survey. Your name is not requested so that all information will be completely confidential. Your openness and accuracy in completing this survey is greatly desired.

The faculty of the College of Education, Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation wishes to thank you for your cooperation.

General Information

Date Graduated _____
Month Year

B.S. _____ M.Ed._____ M.A._____

Undergraduate major _____

Graduate major _____

Male _____ Female _____

Age _____

Number of years in teaching _____

Present position _____

Number of years in present position _____

Type of facility: Private or parochial school _____ Public school _____ Other _____
(identif

Check the most appropriate description of your present attitude towards the preparation you received at Memphis State University, Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation.

A. Very satisfied ____
B. Somewhat satisfied _____
C. Neutral _____
D. Somewhat dissatisfied _____
E. Very dissatisfied _____

(OVER)

An Equal Opportunity University

QUESTIONNAIRE TO GRADUATES
IN SPECIAL EDUCATION FROM MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Directions: On the left please evaluate each statement as to its importance to Special Education by circling the appropriate numeral (1) undesirable, (2) desirable, (3) important, (4) very important, (5) essential. On the right, circle the numeral that best describes the overall preparation you received in each area from Memphis State University's program in Special Education (1) not adequate, (2) barely adequate, (3) adequate (4) good, (5) excellent.

Importance Undesirable Essential		Preparation Not Adequate Excellent
1 2 3 4 5	1. Understanding of the history of Special Education and of current trends and issues in the field.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	2. Complying with the content and intent of local, state and federal laws, regulations and guidelines.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	3. Knowledge about the characteristics of and the social-educational needs of exceptional learners across different age ranges and with different handicapping conditions of varying degrees of severity.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	4. Understanding of an application of the basic theoretical frameworks used to explain normal behavior, development, and learning.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	5. Knowledge of and application of procedures of diagnostic and educational assessment.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	6. Translating assessment findings into instructional activities appropriate to individual needs.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	7. Applying appropriate classroom and behavior management techniques.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	8. Implementing and evaluating educational plans through the use of appropriate instructional methodology, curricula, and materials.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	9. Developing appropriate interactions with families of exceptional learners, regular classroom teachers, school administrators, and other support staff who provide services to exceptional learners.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	10. Improving the educational program for exceptional students by use of community resources.	1 2 3 4 5

Additional comments _____

In your current position, what Special Education program experiences, information, skills, etc. have you found most beneficial?

Which ones were not in your program, but which are necessary for your position?